Direct Search for keV Sterile Neutrino Dark Matter with a Stable Dysprosium Target

T. Lasserre,[1,2,3,*] K. Altenmueller,[1,3,4] M. Cribier,[1,2] A. Merle,[5] S. Mertens,[4,5,6] and M. Vivier[1]

[1] *Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique et aux Energies Alternatives, Centre de Saclay, IRFU, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France*
[2] *Astroparticule et Cosmologie APC, 10 rue Alice Domon et Léonie Duquet, 75205 Paris cedex 13, France*
[3] *Institute for Advanced Study, Technische Universität München, James-Franck-Str. 1, 85748 Garching, Germany*
[4] *Physik-Department and Excellence Cluster Universe, Technische Universität München, James-Franck-Str. 1, 85748 Garching*
[5] *Max-Planck-Institut für Physik (Werner-Heisenberg-Institut), Foehringer Ring 6, 80805 München, Germany*
[6] *Institut für Kernphysik, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie (KIT), D-76021 Karlsruhe, Germany*

(Dated: September 29, 2016)

We investigate a new method to search for keV-scale sterile neutrinos that could account for Dark Matter. Neutrinos trapped in our galaxy could be captured on stable ^{163}Dy if their mass is greater than 2.83 keV. Two experimental realizations are studied, an integral counting of ^{163}Ho atoms in dysprosium-rich ores and a real-time measurement of the emerging electron spectrum in a dysprosium-based detector. The capture rates are compared to the solar neutrino and radioactive backgrounds. An integral counting experiment using several kilograms of ^{163}Dy could reach a sensitivity for the sterile-to-active mixing angle $\sin^2\theta_{e4}$ of 10^{-5} significantly exceeding current laboratory limits. Mixing angles as low as $\sin^2\theta_{e4} \sim 10^{-7}$ / $\mathrm{m}_{^{163}\mathrm{Dy}}$(ton) could possibly be explored with a real-time experiment.

arXiv:1609.04671v2 [hep-ex] 27 Sep 2016

Although the existence of dark matter (DM) is strongly supported by cosmological observations [1], its nature is unknown. The Standard Model (SM) of elementary particle physics does not provide any suitable option. Hence other candidates have been proposed in several theories beyond the SM [2]. The most popular are Weakly Interacting Massive Particles (WIMPs) often identified with neutralinos in supersymmetric extensions of the SM [3–6]. WIMPs in the mass range (100 MeV - 10 TeV) would have non-relativistic velocities at the time of galactic structure formation leading to the creation of a great number of galactic-scale structures. However when compared to N-body simulations of structure formation [7] some discrepancies arise at scales smaller than 10 kpc. Too few dwarf satellite galaxies have been observed compared to what CDM models predict, leading to the so-called missing satellite problem [8, 9]. Furthermore, CDM simulations also predict too many halos larger than dwarfs compared to observations. However it is hard to explain why haloes of that size would fail producing visible stars, leading to the too-big-to-fail issue [10]. Finally observations also tend to favor a cored profile of galaxies while simulations predict a cuspy matter distribution [11]. Although astrophysical feedback effects [12–14] or refinement of the simulations including baryons [15, 16] could perhaps solve those CDM issues, no consensus has yet been reached in the community. So far, no direct DM search experiment has conclusively reported a detection [2], providing further motivations for in-depth experimental investigation of alternatives.

Sterile neutrinos appear in several extensions of the SM as right-handed neutral fermions acting as singlets under the SM gauge group, not interacting but mixing with active neutrinos [17]. No gauge symmetry forbids the introduction of a Majorana mass term for the right-handed neutrino. Such mass term could have an arbitrary scale [18]. Hence a sterile neutrino with a keV mass scale could exist and account for a great part of DM [19]. They are referred to as the Cosmic keV Neutrino Background, Cν_{keV}B, in the following. The lower bound on their mass, with a value around 1 keV, originates from the Pauli principle limiting the number of fermions contained inside a galaxy (Tremaine-Gunn bound [20, 21]). A stringent bound on their mass and mixing is given by X-ray observations since sterile neutrinos could decay with the emission of mono-energetic photons. Recently two independent groups reported evidence for a 3.5 keV emission line that could be due to the decay of a 7.1 keV relic neutrino with $\sin^2(2\theta) \sim 10^{-10}$ [22, 23]. This observation is being fiercely debated [24–31]. Hardly interacting, keV neutrinos could be gradually produced since their corresponding mass eigenstate is partially active and sterile. Resonantly enhanced oscillations in the early Universe related to lepton number violation (Shi-Fuller mechanism) could explain cosmological observation and also explain the 7.1 keV sterile neutrino signal [32–34]. Other production mechanisms have also been proposed, like singlet scalar decay [35–37] or Diluton decay [38]. In some of these models the DM velocity spectrum significantly deviates from a thermal spectrum and keV sterile neutrinos then could be described neither as solely warm nor cold DM [19], thus possibly circumventing Lyman-α constraints [39, 40]. Like any non-relativistic particle, keV sterile neutrinos (ν_4) cluster in the gravitational potential wells of galaxies. Assuming that DM neutrinos of mass m_4 account for the entire local DM density, $\rho_{\mathrm{DM}} \simeq 0.3 \pm 0.1\ \mathrm{GeV}\cdot\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$ [41], their local number

density is $n_{\nu_4} \simeq (300 \pm 100) \cdot 10^3 / \, m_4(\mathrm{keV})\, \mathrm{cm}^{-3}$, hence up to a factor 1000 larger than the Cosmic (active) Neutrino Background (CνB) and roughly 10^6 times larger than for WIMPs. Considering an isothermal Milky Way halo we assume the Cν_{keV}B velocity to follow a shifted Maxwellian distribution with an average value of v_{ν_4}=220 km/s [42].

The generic electron (anti)neutrino induced β-capture on a radioactive nucleus R, $\overset{(-)}{\nu}_e + R \rightarrow R' + e^{\pm}$, was addressed in [43, 44]. Due to the positive energy balance $Q_\beta = M_a(R) - M_a(R') > 0$ [45] this exothermic reaction is always allowed independently of the value of the incoming neutrino energy E_ν. This process is therefore appealing for the detection of the CνB which are expected to have today a tiny kinetic energy $T_{C\nu B} \sim 0.5$ meV [43, 44, 46]. Considering the case of tritium, a relevant CνB experiment necessitate ~ 100 g of radioactive target material [47–52]. This is a huge technical challenge [51] when compared to the already large amount of tritium, ~ 50 μg, to be used in the KATRIN experiment [53]. Nevertheless it is interesting to look at the characteristic signal associated with this process as the emerging electron would create a mono-energetic peak at $T_e = E_0 + m_\nu$, where T_e is the electron kinetic energy, E_0 is the endpoint energy of the β-decay, and m_ν is the effective electron neutrino mass. In the case of the CνB, a sub-eV energy resolution is required to distinguish this signal from the tail distribution of the β-decay spectrum.

Likewise the detection of the Cν_{keV}B through DM ν-capture on β-decaying nuclei was also considered [52, 54, 55]. The Cν_{keV}B induced mono-energetic electron signal would appear at $T_e = E_0 + m_4$, thus comfortly distinguishable with standard nuclear physics technology. However the expected capture rate suffers from a potentially strong suppression factor $\sin^2\theta_{e4}$ induced by the mixing between the sterile and active neutrino components. A mass of radioactive material, on the scale of 100 g for tritium [52], 10 kg for ^{106}Ru [55], and 600 tons for ^{163}Ho [56], would thus be required to probe a mixing angle of the order of $\sin^2\theta_{e4} \sim 10^{-6}$. While procuring this amount of radioactive material is extremely challenging such a mass is in contrast conceivable with a non-radioactive target material.

We now generically consider the capture of keV sterile neutrinos on a stable nucleus S leading to the radioactive daughter nucleus D, produced as a positive ion:

$$\nu + {}_Z\mathrm{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{e}^- + {}_{(Z+1)}\mathrm{D}^+ . \qquad (1)$$

To be energetically possible without minimum kinetic energy from the incident neutrino, the mass of this hypothetical sterile neutrino must satisfy

$$m_4 \geq \Delta(\mathrm{S}) - \Delta(\mathrm{D}) - E_b(D^+) + E_b(\mathrm{D}) \simeq Q_{\mathrm{EC}}^{\mathrm{tab}} , \qquad (2)$$

where E_b define the binding energies of the orbital electrons. The difference in the total binding energy of the neutral atom and the single positive ion is $\sim$100 eV and can be neglected. Δ are the usual tabulated mass excess and $Q_{\mathrm{EC}}^{\mathrm{tab}}$ denotes the tabulated Q-value assuming $m_\nu = 0$ [57]. Thus the Cν_{keV}B capture on stable nuclei can be stimulated by the neutrino mass energy for $-m_{\nu_4} < Q_\beta \leq 0$.

S-R	π^P	Q_β^{tab} (keV)	$\mathcal{A}$(S) (%)	Decay Mode $T_{1/2}$ (y)
^{205}Tl-Pb	$1/2^+ \rightarrow 5/2^-$	-50.6	70.5	EC ($1.5 \cdot 10^7$)
^{163}Dy-Ho	$5/2^- \rightarrow 7/2^-$	-2.83	24.9	EC (4570)

TABLE I. Stable (S) nuclei with radioactive daughters (R) such that $-50 < Q_{\beta-} \leq 0$ keV. Spin (π), parity (P), and Q_β^{tab} are given for ground state to ground state transitions. $\mathcal{A}$(S) is the natural abundance of the stable isotope and $T_{1/2}$ is the half-life of the daughter nucleus.

Two stable isotopes have a negative $Q_\beta^{\mathrm{tab}} \gtrsim -50$ keV (see table I), ^{205}Tl and ^{163}Dy [58], the former being studied for assessing the integrated solar neutrino flux during the past few million years [59, 60]. Let us focus on the ν-capture from the nuclear ground state of ^{163}Dy to the ground state of ^{163}Ho

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{163}\mathrm{Dy}(\mathrm{gs}, I^\pi = 5/2^-) + \nu_4(\, m_4 > 2.83 \text{ keV}) \\ \rightarrow {}^{163}\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{gs}, I'^{\pi'} = 7/2^-) + e^- , \end{aligned} \qquad (3)$$

stimulated by the neutrino mass energy if $m_4 > 2.83$ keV [61]. Subsequently the ^{163}Ho nuclei decays through electron capture (EC) with a half-life of 4570 years. The production rate of ^{163}Ho is given by

$$R_{^{163}\mathrm{Ho}} = N_{^{163}\mathrm{Dy}} \cdot < \sigma_c v_{\nu_4} > \cdot n_{\nu_4} \cdot \sin^2\theta_{e4} , \qquad (4)$$

where $N_{^{163}\mathrm{Dy}}$ is the number of target ^{163}Dy atoms and $< \sigma_c v_{\nu_4} >$ denotes the averaged product of the capture cross section and the Cν_{keV}B velocity. Following [44] the cross sections of the process (3) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma = G_F^2 \cdot \cos^2\theta_C \cdot {m_e}^2/\pi \cdot |\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{nucl}}|^2 \cdot \tfrac{2I'+1}{2I+1} \cdot \\ < \tfrac{c}{v_{\nu_4}} \cdot E_e \cdot p_e \cdot F(E_e) > \mathrm{cm}^2 , \end{aligned} \qquad (5)$$

where G_F is the Fermi constant, θ_C is the Cabbibo angle, E_e and p_e are the electron energy and momentum, evaluated with m_e as the unit of energy, $F(E_e)$ is the Fermi function, and $|\mathcal{M}_{nucl}|$ the nuclear matrix element for reaction (3). It can be determined by studying the decay of completely ionized $^{163}Dy^{66+}$ through bound state β-decay (β_b-decay) together with the emission of a monochromatic $\bar{\nu}_e$ [62]. Since the nuclear parts of ν-capture and of β_b-decay are identical, a measurement of

the β_b-decay probability of bare ^{163}Dy provides the unknown nuclear matrix element for the transition to the ground state (gs) of ^{163}Ho [63]. Indeed the β_b-decay was observed by storing bare ^{163}Dy^{66+} ions in a heavy-ion storage ring. A half-life of 47 ± 4 days was derived [64], in agreement with the predicted half-life of 50 days. This leads to $ft \simeq 6300/\left|\mathcal{M}_{nucl}\right|^2 \sim 10^5$ [65], a value 6 times higher than the ft value for the ^{163}Ho EC-decay.



FIG. 1. Number of ^{163}Ho atoms per $\sin^2\theta_{e4}$ produced in 1 tons of ^{163}Dy through Cν_{keV}B capture on ^{163}Dy as a function of sterile neutrino mass, m_4. Two cases are displayed: an exposure of 10 years for the real-time detection and an exposure of 30000 years for the integral measurement.

In the non-relativistic approximation the cross section (eq. 5) can be expressed as

$$\sigma(\mathrm{m_4}) \simeq 4.8 \cdot 10^{-43} \cdot \mathrm{E_e(m_4)} \cdot \mathrm{p_e(m_4)} \cdot \mathrm{F(m_4)\,cm^2}\,, \quad (6)$$

where the nuclear size and electron screening effects are taken into account in the Fermi function [66]. For m_4=5 keV about $10^7 \times \sin^2\theta_{e4}$ ^{163}Ho atoms are produced in 1 ton of ^{163}Dy exposed for 10 years. The number of expected Cν_{keV}B capture as a function of their mass is shown in figure 1. The maximal production rate is reached at the threshold, m_4=2.83 keV. For higher masses the rate decreases since fewer neutrinos are needed to fill the DM galactic halo. Taking into account the capture rates given in eq. (4) the search for Cν_{keV}B appears extremely challenging, mainly because of the huge attenuation factor $\sin^2\theta_{e4} \lesssim 10^{-6}$, as discussed in [19]. It is therefore appealing to consider an integral experiment where the ^{163}Dy has been exposed over a geologic time, t, enhancing the number of Cν_{keV}B captures given by

$$N_{^{163}\mathrm{Ho}}(\mathrm{t, m_4, \sin^2\theta_{e4}, m_{^{163}Dy}}) = \frac{\mathrm{m_{^{163}Dy}} \cdot \mathcal{N}_\mathrm{A}}{\mathrm{A_{^{163}Dy}} \cdot \lambda^{\mathrm{EC}}_{^{163}\mathrm{Ho}}} \times \sigma(\mathrm{m_4}) < \mathrm{v_{\nu_4}} > \mathrm{n_{\nu_4}} (1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda^{\mathrm{EC}}_{^{163}\mathrm{Ho}} \cdot \mathrm{t}}) \cdot \sin^2\theta_{\mathrm{e4}}\,, \quad (7)$$

where $A_{^{163}\mathrm{Dy}}$ is the ^{163}Dy molar mass and $m_{^{163}\mathrm{Dy}}$ is the target mass. After an exposure of more than 30000 years an equilibrium is reached between the ^{163}Ho production and subsequent EC decays. For m_4=5 keV about $7 \cdot 10^9 \cdot \sin^2\theta_{e4}$ atoms of ^{163}Ho are expected in 1 ton of ^{163}Dy. This is a gain of three orders of magnitude with respect to a 10 year exposure of a fresh ^{163}Dy target (see figure 1).

Solar neutrinos and geoneutrinos with energies above 2.83 keV are also captured on ^{163}Dy. The geoneutrino ν_e flux produced by the EC decay of ^{40}K [67] is smaller than the SνB , thus we neglect it in the following. However the SνB constitutes a background for the search of the Cν_{keV}B. The capture rates are calculated using the standard solar model including MSW neutrino oscillations [68]. A capture rate of 660 SNU is expected, where 1 SNU corresponds to 10^{-36} ν-capture per ^{163}Dy atom per second. It is dominated by the pp (83.5%) and ^{7}Be (14.0%) whereas pep, ^{15}O, ^{19}F, ^{13}N and hep solar neutrinos contribute less than 2.5% (see figure 2). In a pure ^{163}Dy target of 1 ton about 400 atoms of ^{163}Ho are produced during a 10 year exposure. But for ^{163}Dy exposed for more than 30000 years one expects $\sim 2.7 \cdot 10^5$ ^{163}Ho atoms per ton of ^{163}Dy.



FIG. 2. Emitted electron spectra of SνB captures in a 1 ton of ^{163}Dy exposed for 10 years.

The first proposed detection method consists in counting the number of ^{163}Ho atoms in rare-earth ores resulting from the ν-capture on ^{163}Dy. Besides ore sampling, transport, mineralogical and chemical treatments (based on ion chromatography to separate neighboring lanthanides), the main challenge is the accurate assessment of a small number of ^{163}Ho atoms out of a large quantity of ^{163}Dy ore. This could in principle be performed by counting the decays of ^{163}Ho

as previous radiochemical experiments succeeded to detect approximately one ν-capture per month per ton of target [69]. However, the half-life of ^{163}Ho, 4570 years, is relatively large and one should then consider other counting methods. ^{163}Ho atoms counting in a buffer gas loaded magneto-optical trap seems promising [70, 71]. As for the separation of ^{163}Ho from other lanthanides, resonance ionization mass spectrometric (RIMS) techniques with lasers could be considered [72]. Accelerator mass spectrometry (AMS) could also be used although it is less sensitive a-priori [73]. Finally neutron activation of ^{163}Ho and the measurement of the subsequent β-decay of ^{164}Ho (29 min half-life) could also be investigated. In what follows we assume that ^{163}Ho atoms can be precisely counted.

The sensitivity is evaluated by minimizing the following χ^2 function

$$\chi^2 = -2 \cdot \left(\mathrm{N^{obs}} - \mathrm{N^{exp}} + \mathrm{N^{obs}} \cdot \ln \frac{\mathrm{N^{exp}}}{\mathrm{N^{obs}}}\right) + \left(\frac{\alpha}{\sigma_\alpha}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\beta}{\sigma_\beta}\right)^2, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathrm{N^{obs}}$ and $\mathrm{N^{exp}} = (1+\alpha)\cdot(\mathrm{N^{C\nu_{keV}B}} + (1+\beta)\cdot\mathrm{N^{S\nu B}})$ are the observed and expected number of ^{163}Ho atoms, respectively. The nuisance parameters α, β account for both the counting efficiency and the SνB uncertainties, σ_α assumed to range from 1 to 20% and σ_β ranging from 1 to 10%. After minimizing the χ^2 function over the nuisance parameters α, β, the 90% C.L. exclusion contours are computed as a function of m_4 and $\sin^2\theta_{e4}$ such that $\Delta\chi^2 = \chi^2(m_4, \sin^2\theta_{e4}) - \chi^2_{\mathrm{min}} < 2.7$ since no information on m_4 can be retrieved through this integral approach. Results shown in figure 3 indicate that a sensitivity of $\sin^2\theta_{e4} \sim 10^{-5}$ is reachable with a kg-scale target mass. This integral approach is limited by the SνB, however. Indeed, for $\sin^2\theta_{e4} \sim 5\cdot10^{-5}$, a similar number of ^{163}Ho atoms is produced by both the Cν_{keV}B and SνB. Assuming a one percent uncertainty in the knowledge of the SνB and the atom counting efficiency the sensitivity could be potentially improved to $\sin^2\theta_{e4} \sim 10^{-6}$.

Very likely mineral ore containing dysprosium contains traces of natural uranium and thorium. These radioactive contaminants produce neutrons via spontaneous fission and (α,n) reactions on light elements (C, O, Na). The neutron flux induces the capture reaction ^{162}Er(n,γ)^{163}Er (19 barn) followed by the EC decay of ^{163}Eu (75 min), leading to ^{163}Ho. Assuming an thermal neutron flux of 10^{-7} n/cm^2/s [74] and taking into account the self-absorption of neutrons on other isotopes, like Gadolinium, we estimate an integral production of less than 1000 ^{163}Ho atoms for a 1 ton ^{162}Er target exposed over a geologic time. Assuming a typical dysprosium-rich rock composition, such as the Adamsite [75], this production is small compared to the



FIG. 3. 90% C.L. sensitivity for Cν_{keV}B integral detection for a target mass of 1 kg, first by assuming an overall counting rate known within 20 to 50 % and a SνB capture rate known with 10% and second by assuming both the counting rate and the SνB capture rate to be known within 1 %.

Cν_{keV}B signal for $\sin^2\theta_{e4} > 10^{-6}$. ^{163}Ho can also be produced by (p,n) or (p,2n) reactions on ^{163}Dy although these reactions only occur for >10 MeV protons. The (p,n) yield is therefore expected to be smaller than for (n,γ) processes. A detailed estimation of natural backgrounds, beyond the scope of this conceptual study, will require detailed Monte-Carlo simulations using selected Dy-based ore compositions and site-dependent proton and neutron fluxes.

To circumvent limitation due to SνB captures in the integral approach another technique, the real-time detection of Cν_{keV}B captures inside an active ^{163}Dy-based detector, can be considered. The characteristic signal is provided by the mono-energetic electron peak at $\mathrm{T_e} = \mathrm{m_4} - 2.83$ keV. Let us consider a detector containing 10 tons of ^{163}Dy exposed for 10 years (see figure 4). For $\sin^2\theta_{e4} = 10^{-6}$ and $\mathrm{m_4}$=10 keV the Cν_{keV}B captures would induce a peak at $\mathrm{T_{e,peak}}$=7.2 keV containing 53 electrons, to be discriminated against backgrounds. Compared to the integral case the SνB is strongly suppressed since less than 1 SνB capture is expected within $\mathrm{T_{e,peak}} \pm 3\ \sigma_T$, Assuming assuming an energy resolution of 0.5 keV (FWHM). In this configuration the real-time approach is entangled with the integral approach. Assuming the Dy-based detector was not purified from holmium atoms, the captures Cν_{keV}B and SνB integrated over a geologic timescale would produce ^{163}Ho atoms resulting in subsequent EC-decays affecting the low energy part of the spectrum as displayed in figure 4.

The sensitivity of the real-time approach is evaluated


Sν B (0 counts in [6.5,7.8] keV)
Cν$_{keV}$B (53 counts), m$_4$=10 keV − sin^{2}θ=1e−06
Cν$_{keV}$B/Sν B induced ^{163}Ho decay (4104 counts)
Counts per 0.20 keV
Electron Kinetic Energy, T$_e$ (keV)

FIG. 4. Electron spectra of Cν_{keV}B and SνB captures on ^{163}Dy and subsequent ^{163}Ho decays, for an exposure of 100 ton·year and a 0.5 keV energy resolution (FWHM).



FIG. 5. 90% C.L. sensitivity for Cν_{keV}B real-time detection for two exposures, 300 kg·year and 100 ton·year (of ^{163}Dy), assuming an energy resolution of 0.5 keV (FWHM).

by minimizing the following χ^2 function

$$\chi^2 = -2 \cdot \sum_i (\mathrm{N^{obs}(E_i) - N^{exp}(E_i)} + \mathrm{N^{obs}(E_i) \cdot \ln \frac{N^{exp}(E_i)}{N^{obs}E_i)}}), \quad (9)$$

where $\mathrm{N^{obs}}$ and $\mathrm{N^{exp}} = \mathrm{N^{C\nu_{keV}B}} + (1+\beta)\cdot \mathrm{N^{S\nu B}} + (1+\gamma)\cdot \mathrm{N^{ho}}$ are the observed and expected number of counts, respectively. The nuisance parameters β, γ for both the SνB capture rate ($\mathrm{N}^{S\nu B}$) and the total ^{163}Ho decays ($\mathrm{N^{ho}}$) are left free in this analysis. After minimizing the χ^2 function over the nuisance parameters β, γ, the 90% C.L. exclusion contours are computed as a function of $\mathrm{m_4}$ and $\sin^2\theta_{e4}$ such that $\Delta\chi^2 = \chi^2(m_4, \sin^2\theta_{e4}) - \chi^2_{\mathrm{min}} < 4.6$ since both $\mathrm{m_4}$ and $\sin^2\theta_{e4}$ could be measured in a real-time experiment. Figure 5 shows the expected sensitivity for Cν_{keV}B real-time detection for two different exposures, 300 kg·year and 100 ton·year, assuming an energy resolution of 0.5 keV (FWHM). Using a few 100 kg of ^{163}Dy a 90% sensitivity down to $\sin^2\theta_{e4} \sim 10^{-6}$ is attainable for $\mathrm{m_4}$ varying from 2.83 to 100 keV. Mixing angles as low as $\sin^2\theta_{e4} \sim 10^{-9}$ could in principle be explored with 100 tons of ^{163}Dy, provided detector backgrounds are less than the SνB capture rate.

We presented and investigated a new method to search for Cosmic keV Neutrino Background, in the keV mass range, that could account for Dark Matter. This approach aims at the detection of hypothetical keV sterile neutrinos confined inside our galactic halo and is therefore complementary to projects using tritium β-decay [76, 77] or xenon [78]. In this new concept the Cν_{keV}B could be captured on stable ^{163}Dy if sterile neutrino masses are greater than 2.83 keV. Two experimental cases are studied. First, by an integral experiment in which one counts the number of ^{163}Ho atoms in a ^{163}Dy ore exposed over a geologic time. In this case the sensitivity to the Cν_{keV}B is strengthened through the accumulation of the captures over the last 30000 years. This approach is limited by the capture of solar neutrinos (SνB), at the level of $\sin^2\theta_{e4} \sim 10^{-6}$. Second, by a real-time experiment measuring the electron spectrum in a Dy-based detector. The characteristic signal is a mono-energetic peak at $\mathrm{T_e = E_0 + m_4}$, thus greatly reducing the impact of the SνB.

To conclude, experiments using several kilograms of ^{163}Dy, for the integral approach, and ∼100 kg of ^{163}Dy, for the real-time measurement, could already reach an unprecedented sensitivity of $\sin^2\theta_{e4} \sim 10^{-5}$ in comparison with past laboratory searches. Thanks to the stability of the dysprosium target this experiment is scalable, in principle. Looking into a farther future a cosmological relevant sensitivity of $\sin^2\theta_{e4} \sim 10^{-9}$ could potentially be achievable with 100 tons of ^{163}Dy exposed for 10 years. Proof-of-concept experiments shall be conducted to experimentally assess backgrounds and technical feasibility, however.

Special thanks goes to J. Rich for many useful inputs and valuable comments. The authors gratefully acknowledge V. Fischer, L. Gastaldo, G. Korschinek, M. Martini, G. Mention, W. Potzel and S. Schönert for fruitful discussions on ν-capture and detection techniques. We would like to thank B. Mac Donough, C. Jaupart, M. Chaussidon, F. Moynier, and B. Marty regarding their inputs on geological issues. T. Lasserre would like to acknowledge

the support of the Technische Universität München Institute for Advanced Study, funded by the German Excellence Initiative and the European Union Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement No. 291763, as well as the European Union Marie Curie COFUND program. A. Merle acknowledges partial support by the Micron Technology Foundation, Inc. A. Merle furthermore acknowledges partial support by the European Union through the FP7 Marie Curie Actions ITN INVISIBLES (PITN-GA-2011-289442) and by the Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreements No. 690575 (InvisiblesPlus RISE) and No. 674896 (Elusives ITN).

* Corresponding author: thierry.lasserre@cea.fr

[1] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), (2015), arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].
[2] M. Cirelli, (2015), arXiv:1511.02031 [astro-ph.HE].
[3] G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski, and K. Griest, Phys. Rept. **267**, 195 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9506380 [hep-ph].
[4] G. B. Gelmini and P. Gondolo, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 023510 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0602230 [hep-ph].
[5] G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, C. Hugonie, A. Pukhov, and A. Semenov, JCAP **0509**, 001 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0505142 [hep-ph].
[6] J. F. Gunion, D. Hooper, and B. McElrath, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 015011 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0509024 [hep-ph].
[7] V. Springel *et al.*, Nature **435**, 629 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0504097 [astro-ph].
[8] A. A. Klypin, A. V. Kravtsov, O. Valenzuela, and F. Prada, Astrophys. J. **522**, 82 (1999), arXiv:astro-ph/9901240 [astro-ph].
[9] B. Moore, S. Ghigna, F. Governato, G. Lake, T. R. Quinn, J. Stadel, and P. Tozzi, Astrophys. J. **524**, L19 (1999), arXiv:astro-ph/9907411 [astro-ph].
[10] M. Boylan-Kolchin, J. S. Bullock, and M. Kaplinghat, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **415**, L40 (2011), arXiv:1103.0007 [astro-ph.CO].
[11] J. Dubinski and R. G. Carlberg, Astrophys. J. **378**, 496 (1991).
[12] A. V. Maccio', X. Kang, F. Fontanot, R. S. Somerville, S. E. Koposov, and P. Monaco, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **402**, 1995 (2010), arXiv:0903.4681 [astro-ph.CO].
[13] S. Garrison-Kimmel, M. Rocha, M. Boylan-Kolchin, J. Bullock, and J. Lally, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **433**, 3539 (2013), arXiv:1301.3137 [astro-ph.CO].
[14] S. Geen, A. Slyz, and J. Devriendt, EAS Publ. Ser. **48**, 441 (2011), arXiv:1101.2232 [astro-ph.GA].
[15] A. M. Brooks and A. Zolotov, Astrophys. J. **786**, 87 (2014), arXiv:1207.2468 [astro-ph.CO].
[16] J. Herpich, G. S. Stinson, A. V. Macci, C. Brook, J. Wadsley, H. M. P. Couchman, and T. Quinn, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **437**, 293 (2014), arXiv:1308.1088 [astro-ph.CO].
[17] A. Merle, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D22**, 1330020 (2013), arXiv:1302.2625 [hep-ph].
[18] E. Majorana, Nuovo Cim. **14**, 171 (1937).
[19] M. Drewes, T. Lasserre, A. Merle, S. Mertens, *et al.*, Submitted to JCAP (2016), arXiv:1602.04816 [hep-ph].
[20] S. Tremaine and J. E. Gunn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 407 (1979).
[21] A. Boyarsky, O. Ruchayskiy, and D. Iakubovskyi, JCAP **0903**, 005 (2009), arXiv:0808.3902 [hep-ph].
[22] A. Boyarsky, O. Ruchayskiy, D. Iakubovskyi, and J. Franse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 251301 (2014), arXiv:1402.4119 [astro-ph.CO].
[23] E. Bulbul, M. Markevitch, A. Foster, R. K. Smith, M. Loewenstein, and S. W. Randall, Astrophys. J. **789**, 13 (2014), arXiv:1402.2301 [astro-ph.CO].
[24] S. Riemer-Sorensen, (2014), arXiv:1405.7943 [astro-ph.CO].
[25] M. E. Anderson, E. Churazov, and J. N. Bregman, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **452**, 3905 (2015), arXiv:1408.4115 [astro-ph.HE].
[26] T. E. Jeltema and S. Profumo, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **450**, 2143 (2015), arXiv:1408.1699 [astro-ph.HE].
[27] D. Iakubovskyi, (2015), arXiv:1507.02857 [astro-ph.HE].
[28] D. Malyshev, A. Neronov, and D. Eckert, Phys. Rev. **D90**, 103506 (2014), arXiv:1408.3531 [astro-ph.HE].
[29] O. Urban, N. Werner, S. W. Allen, A. Simionescu, J. S. Kaastra, and L. E. Strigari, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **451**, 2447 (2015), arXiv:1411.0050 [astro-ph.CO].
[30] T. Tamura, R. Iizuka, Y. Maeda, K. Mitsuda, and N. Y. Yamasaki, Publ. Astron. Soc. Jap. **67**, 23 (2015), arXiv:1412.1869 [astro-ph.HE].
[31] F. A. Aharonian *et al.* (Hitomi), (2016), arXiv:1607.07420 [astro-ph.HE].
[32] X.-D. Shi and G. M. Fuller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2832 (1999), arXiv:astro-ph/9810076 [astro-ph].
[33] L. Canetti, M. Drewes, T. Frossard, and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 093006 (2013), arXiv:1208.4607 [hep-ph].
[34] K. N. Abazajian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 161303 (2014), arXiv:1403.0954 [astro-ph.CO].
[35] A. Merle, V. Niro, and D. Schmidt, JCAP **1403**, 028 (2014), arXiv:1306.3996 [hep-ph].
[36] A. Merle and M. Totzauer, JCAP **1506**, 011 (2015), arXiv:1502.01011 [hep-ph].
[37] J. Knig, A. Merle, and M. Totzauer, (2016), arXiv:1609.01289 [hep-ph].
[38] A. V. Patwardhan, G. M. Fuller, C. T. Kishimoto, and A. Kusenko, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 103509 (2015), arXiv:1507.01977 [astro-ph.CO].
[39] A. Merle and A. Schneider, Phys. Lett. **B749**, 283 (2015), arXiv:1409.6311 [hep-ph].
[40] J. Baur, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, C. Yche, C. Magneville, and M. Viel, in *SDSS-IV Collaboration Meeting, July 20-23, 2015* (2015) arXiv:1512.01981 [astro-ph.CO].

[41] J. Bovy and S. Tremaine, Astrophys. J. **756**, 89 (2012), arXiv:1205.4033 [astro-ph.GA].

[42] K. Freese, J. A. Frieman, and A. Gould, Phys. Rev. **D37**, 3388 (1988).

[43] A. G. Cocco, G. Mangano, and M. Messina, JCAP **0706**, 015 (2007).

[44] R. Lazauskas, P. Vogel, and C. Volpe, J. Phys. G **35**, 025001 (2008).

[45] M_a denotes the masses of neutral atoms, M_n denotes the nuclear masses.

[46] A. Faessler, R. Hodak, S. Kovalenko, and F. Šimkovic, in *European Physical Journal Web of Conferences*, European Physical Journal Web of Conferences, Vol. 71 (2014) p. 00044.

[47] M. Blennow, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 113014 (2008), arXiv:0803.3762 [astro-ph].

[48] Y. F. Li, Z.-z. Xing, and S. Luo, Phys. Lett. **B692**, 261 (2010), arXiv:1007.0914 [astro-ph.CO].

[49] A. Kaboth, J. A. Formaggio, and B. Monreal, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 062001 (2010), arXiv:1006.1886 [hep-ex].

[50] A. Faessler, R. Hodak, S. Kovalenko, and F. ?imkovic, *Proceedings, 2nd International Conference on New Frontiers in Physics (ICNFP 2013)*, Rom. J. Phys. **58**, 1221 (2013), arXiv:1304.5632 [nucl-th].

[51] S. Betts *et al.*, in *Community Summer Study 2013: Snowmass on the Mississippi (CSS2013), Minneapolis, MN, USA, July 29-August 6* (2013) arXiv:1307.4738 [astro-ph.IM].

[52] A. J. Long, C. Lunardini, and E. Sabancilar, JCAP **1408**, 038 (2014), arXiv:1405.7654 [hep-ph].

[53] J. Angrik *et al.* (KATRIN), (2005).

[54] M. Shaposhnikov, in *Neutrino telescopes. Proceedings, 12th International Workshop, Venice, Italy, March 6-9, 2007* (2007) pp. 601–615, arXiv:0706.1894 [hep-ph].

[55] Y. F. Li and Z.-z. Xing, Phys. Lett. **B695**, 205 (2011), arXiv:1009.5870 [hep-ph].

[56] Y. F. Li and Z.-Z. Xing, JCAP **1108**, 006 (2011), arXiv:1104.4000 [astro-ph.CO].

[57] G. Audi *et al.*, Chinese Physics C **36** (2012).

[58] C. Bennett, Phys. Rev. **C36**, 1522 (1987).

[59] M. S. Freedman, C. M. Stevens, E. P. Horwitz, L. H. Fuchs, J. L. Lerner, L. S. Goodman, W. J. Childs, and J. Hessler, Science **193**, 1117 (1976).

[60] M. K. Pavicevic *et al.*, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2012**, 274614 (2012).

[61] S. Eliseev *et al.* (ECHo), Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 062501 (2015), arXiv:1604.04210 [physics.ins-det].

[62] R. Daudel and M. Lecoin, J. Phys. Radium **8**, 238 (1947).

[63] J. N. Bahcall, Phys. Rev. **124**, 495 (1961).

[64] M. Jung *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2164 (1992).

[65] K. Takahashi, R. N. Boyd, G. J. Mathews, and K. Yokoi, Phys. Rev. **C36**, 1522 (1987).

[66] G. Shenter and P. Vogel, Nuclear Science and Engineering **83**, 393 (1983).

[67] G. Fiorentini, F. Mantovani, and B. Ricci, Phys. Lett. **B557**, 139 (2003), arXiv:nucl-ex/0212008 [nucl-ex].

[68] J. N. Bahcall, A. M. Serenelli, and S. Basu, Astrophys. J. **621**, L85 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0412440 [astro-ph].

[69] W. Hampel *et al.* (GALLEX), Phys. Lett. **B447**, 127 (1999).

[70] B. Hemmerling, G. K. Drayna, E. Chae, A. Ravi, and J. M. Doyle, New Journal of Physics **16**, 063070 (2014).

[71] W. Jiang, K. Bailey, Z.-T. Lu, P. Mueller, T. OConnor, C.-F. Cheng, S.-M. Hu, R. Purtschert, N. Sturchio, Y. Sun, W. Williams, and G.-M. Yang, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta **91**, 1 (2012).

[72] T. Kieck, Wissenschaftliche Pruefungsarbeit in Physik fuer die Erste Staatsprüfung fuer das Lehramt an Gymnasien, Johannes Gutenberg-Universitaet Mainz, (2015).

[73] K. Knie, G. Korschinek, T. Faestermann, E. A. Dorfi, G. Rugel, and A. Wallner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 171103 (2004).

[74] A. Best, J. Grres, M. Junker, K.-L. Kratz, M. Laubenstein, A. Long, S. V. Nsh, K. Smith, and M. Wiescher, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. **A812**, 1 (2016), arXiv:1509.00770 [physics.ins-det].

[75] American Mineralogist **86**, 1112.

[76] S. Mertens, T. Lasserre, S. Groh, G. Drexlin, F. Glueck, A. Huber, A. W. P. Poon, M. Steidl, N. Steinbrink, and C. Weinheimer, JCAP **1502**, 020 (2015), arXiv:1409.0920 [physics.ins-det].

[77] S. Mertens, K. Dolde, M. Korzeczek, F. Glueck, S. Groh, R. D. Martin, A. W. P. Poon, and M. Steidl, Phys. Rev. **D91**, 042005 (2015), arXiv:1410.7684 [hep-ph].

[78] M. D. Campos and W. Rodejohann, (2016), arXiv:1605.02918 [hep-ph].